

EXHIBIT 6

This email serves as notice that we, the only women on the board of NYU's Federalist Society, are resigning from our Board positions as VP of Internal Affairs and Julia Ward Howe Chair. Here's why:

NYU's Federalist Society just held a vote deciding to host a series of anti-choice, "pro-life" activists. This vote was prompted by an email from us, the two women on the FedSoc Board, found below.* During this meeting, we both voiced strong opposition to the event itself. The other four members of the Board present, all men, voted in favor of having the event. After a decision to have the event was ratified, a vote was taken on which of the five speakers proposed would be selected. The only speaker who received the majority of votes needed for approval was the **only male speaker** on the shortlist of five possible speakers. This speaker is adamant abortion is murder and that [the court must overrule Roe](#). None of the four female speakers received enough votes. In both votes, the only votes in favor of both having the speaker and of the speakers selected were by **male board members**. The only votes in opposition were from the two women.

In a discussion following the second vote, the President admitted that the motivation for this event was to have a pro-life vs. pro-choice debate and express a view of "what the law should be," admitting his initial reasoning for the event (a discussion of the legal arguments in *Dobbs*) was pretextual. This runs in direct opposition to one of the primary tenets of the Federalist Society -- rule of law, which is for the judiciary to say "what the law is" and "not what it should be." It was only after a male Board member cited concerns about the 'optics' of having a male speaker on abortion that the President made an *ad hoc* decision later that night to postpone a final decision on the speakers -- disregarding the vote that had occurred in the room and keeping open the possibility of inviting one of the other extremist speakers on the list.

This process has been incredibly frustrating, and tabling the decision as to the speaker is a paperthin attempt to save face, after many pretextual antics in an attempt to bring a number of radical, extremist anti-woman and anti-choice speakers to campus. These speakers think it is the providence of the judiciary to say what the law should be based on their individual religion and moral positioning, in complete disregard of precedent.

Below is an excerpt of our opposition to the event and speakers as presented during the Board meeting:

...these speakers are highly political and their arguments are rooted in personal opinion and moral posturing, not crisp legal analysis.

The national org had a Dobbs event which is clearly about the legal framework at play here — whether Roe was LEGALLY properly decided and if its reasoning was sound. Whether overturning it would run counter to rule of law. These are legitimate legal questions that do not require passing moral judgment on what women choose to do with their bodies. Most of the primary speakers under consideration are activist lawyers whose positions on abortion are not about the legal reasoning behind Roe, but instead are based on their views that abortion is murder, with one wholly misrepresenting abortion as [babies being ripped limb by limb](#) and [who does not believe that there should even be exceptions for first trimester abortions in cases of rape or incest](#). [] There is a reason legitimate legal professionals and scholars are unwilling to be on a panel with someone like [Erika Bachiochi](#) — she's putting forward policy positions based on personal views of the morality of abortion.

There are legitimate topics of discussion to be had on Dobbs. Whether changes in science and modern contexts should enable a dynamic reading of the law, in this case the matter of viability, and thereby affect precedence. What the scope of *Roe v Wade* is and potential ambiguities. What happens the next day if *Roe v Wade* is overturned and possible ramifications [] for how the court engages in defining and interpretation of fundamental rights []. Instead, certain board members have suggested the most polarising Ben Shapiro-esque activist lawyer types to come talk. Speakers who will alienate female members of the board, will draw a lot of anger from the NYU Law community, and make it clear that NYU Law FedSoc does not stand for the principles it claims it stands for of being a nonpartisan organisation interested in rule of law and individual rights, and instead is an activist

There are legitimate topics of discussion to be had on Dobbs. Whether changes in science and modern contexts should enable a dynamic reading of the law, in this case the matter of viability, and thereby affect precedence. What the scope of Roe v Wade is and potential ambiguities. What happens the next day if Roe v Wade is overturned and possible ramifications [] for how the court engages in defining and interpretation of fundamental rights[]]. Instead, certain board members have suggested the most polarising Ben Shapiro-esque activist lawyer types to come talk. Speakers who will alienate female members of the board, will draw a lot of anger from the NYU Law community, and make it clear that NYU Law FedSoc does not stand for the principles it claims it stands for of being a nonpartisan organisation interested in rule of law and individual rights, and instead is an activist conservative Republican organisation disinterested in legitimate legal inquiry. I cannot support this.

Furthermore, there's no way for an impartial audience member to view this as anything but an endorsement of the speakers' personal [pro-life] views, especially with the continued justification that they are on the pre-approved speakers list. Choosing specifically to invite one of them and not others from the pre-approved speakers list who have different views cements this. I don't think a compelling reason to have a speaker just for the sake of a counter makes sense. We wouldn't have a speaker defending genocide.

Please accept our sincerest apologies for failing to prevent NYU Law's chapter of the Federalist Society from following the national trend of becoming Turning Point USA, Law School Edition. The organization we thought we were joining was one that stood for principles such as rule of law and individual liberties -- values both of us still strongly believe in. Our resignations in no way signify a retreat from those principles.

Sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction mark covering a signature.

*Email:

Dear Fellow Board Members,

We support vibrant discussion of contemporary **legal** issues and are open to supporting a debate of matters regarding abortion that state ***what the law is -- not what it should be***. This means that hosting activist lawyers with a personal interest in changing the legal code in decisional law to preclude all access to abortion is at odds with this mission statement and not within the scope of the activities of the group.

Inviting anyone to engage in extremist anti-choice, anti-woman/minority and fundamentally anti-liberty moral posturing against the strong and vocal dissent of the only two women on the Board shows blatant disregard for the views and personhood of the women of NYU FedSoc. What's more, this decision was made without full consensus of the Board and with discretionary decision making by the President which created confusion for multiple board members as to what was actually happening with the event and what our votes meant.

An event like this will reflect poorly on NYU Law's FedSoc Chapter, alienate potential female members (as it already has) and has nothing to do with the purpose of the Federalist Society. It is clearly about advancing anti-choice views in furtherance of the political ideology of certain board members, and is *not* the type of non-partisan topics around which we should be seeking to encourage legal discussion.

Per *Roe v. Wade*, women in the United States of America have a right to an abortion prior to fetal viability and advocating to bring speakers who do not believe in precedent and actively advocate for laws which are in direct violation of federal constitutional protections is antithetical to rule of law. Further, bringing speakers who do not believe in fact and engage in pseudo-science and faulty moral posturing is counterproductive to constructive debate.

There is no reason to have this event and it would actively harm both the legitimacy of NYU Law Federalist Society in the eyes of the NYU Law community and severely undermine recruitment efforts.

We entirely oppose having this event.